

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

7 BRETT BROOKE SONIA,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 DR. KARIE RAINER, DR. BRUCE
11 GAGE, DR. DAN POTENZA, HELEN
12 HANKS, KEVIN BOVENCAMP and
13 DR. E. ZEIGER,

Defendants.

NO: 4:19-CV-5059-TOR

ORDER DISMISSING FIRST
AMENDED COMPLAINT

14 By Order filed July 10, 2019, the Court advised *pro se* Plaintiff, a New
15 Hampshire State prisoner housed at the Washington State Penitentiary, of the
16 deficiencies of her civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and directed her to
17 amend. ECF No. 7. On July 16, 2019, Plaintiff submitted a 46-page amended
18 complaint. ECF No. 8. She then presented a 180-page “Memorandum of Law” and
19 “Material Facts in dispute,” on July 29, 2019, ECF No. 9, and an additional 35 pages
20 on July 30, 2019, ECF No. 10, which had apparently been omitted from her July 29,

1 2019 submission. Having liberally reviewed Ms. Sonia's documents in the light
2 most favorable to her, the Court finds that she has failed to cure the deficiencies set
3 forth in the Order to Amend or Voluntarily Dismiss. ECF No. 7.

4 Plaintiff continues to challenge the implementation of a settlement agreement
5 she obtained in the U.S. District Court, District of New Hampshire against
6 Defendants Dr. Daniel Petenza, Helen Hanks, and newly named Defendants Paula
7 Mattis and "Does." Plaintiff offers no explanation why this Court would have
8 jurisdiction to enforce the terms of a settlement agreement or an order entered in
9 another court. Her claims against New Hampshire Defendants Petenza, Hanks,
10 Mattis and "Does" are **DISMISSED without prejudice** for lack of jurisdiction.

11 Although Plaintiff provides a plethora of information, she presents no facts
12 from which the Court could infer that identified Defendants located in the Eastern
13 District of Washington have been deliberately indifferent to her serious medical
14 needs. *Hamby v. Hammond*, 821 F.3d 1085, 1092 (9th Cir. 2016). Her broad and
15 conclusory statements are insufficient to state a plausible claim for relief. *Ashcroft*
16 *v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 679 (2009).

17 For the reasons set forth above and in the Order to Amend or Voluntarily
18 Dismiss, ECF No. 7, **IT IS ORDERED** that the First Amended Complaint is
19 **DISMISSED without prejudice** to Plaintiff filing her claims in the appropriate
20 forum. Under *Washington v. L.A. Cty. Sheriff's Dep't*, 833 F.3d 1048 (9th Cir.


1 2016), this dismissal will NOT count as a “strike” pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

2 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to enter this Order,
3 enter judgment, provide copies to Plaintiff and **CLOSE** the file. The Court certifies
4 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal of this Order would not be taken
5 in good faith and would lack any arguable basis in law or fact. Plaintiff’s *in forma*
6 *pauperis* status is hereby **REVOKED**.

7 **DATED** September 16, 2019.



10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20


THOMAS O. RICE
Chief United States District Judge